DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 634 CG 010 466

AUTHOR Johnson, Michael P.; Sell, Ralph R.
TITLE The Cost of Being Black: 1970.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, California, August 25-29, 1975); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Employment Patterns; *Employment Statistics; Employment Trends; Labor Economics; Labor Force; *Males; *Negroes; Research Projects; Speeches; *Statistical Data

ABSTRACT

An analysis of U.S. Census data regarding race, age, education, occupation, and income of the male civilian labor force in 1960 and 1970 yields four major conclusions. (1) There have been large reductions in occupational discrimination at all ages, with the change clearest for young men. (2) The reduction of occupational discrimination is clearest at the lowest and highest educational levels. (3) The absolute gap between black and white income (in constant dollars) has increased. (4) The increased income gap is due in large part to a general shift upward in educational level of the labor force. Comparisons are made with changes from 1950 to 1960 and more detailed analyses provide some suggestions as to differential sources of change in the two decades. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120634

The Cost of Being Black: 1970

Michael P. Johnson
Ralph R. Sell

The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Sociology
Liberal Arts Tower
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Presented at American Sociological Association, San Francisco, 1975.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Cost of Being Black: 1970

In 1965 Paul Siegel reported changes in white-nonwhite occupational and income differentials from 1950 to 1960. A number of similar analyses of changes from 1960 to 1970 have appeared (e.g. Farley and Hermalin, 1972; Fox and Faine, 1973; Hauser and Featherman, 1974), but none have used the decomposition techniques utilized by Siegel to indicate the sources of income differentials and none have compared the changes during the 1960-70 decade with the changes from 1950 to 1960. The present paper duplicates Siegel's analysis for the 1960-1970 decade and presents further evidence for some of the hypotheses which he presented concerning the sources of some of the patterns in the data.

During the period from 1960 to 1970 a number of changes in governmental policy took place which were designed to reduce occupational and income discrimination on the basis of race or sex (See Johnson and Sell, 1974, for data on sex discrimination). The civil rights legislation of 1964 and 1968 provided major tools for the legal battle against occupational discrimination. Government intervention in the form of affirmative action guidelines and legal action against employers suspected of racial discrimination should have made the 1960-1970 decade a period of major change in the extent of white-nonwhite differentials in occupation and income.

Occupational Distribution

Table 1 contains indices of dissimilarity of occupation

Table 1 About Here

---

for four age cohorts by five educational levels. The index (Duncan and Duncan, 1955) indicates the proportion of the nonwhite (or white) labor force which would have to change major occupational category in order to equate the white-nonwhite occupational distribution for that particular age and educational level.

Intercohort Comparisons. There are two kinds of comparisons in Table 1 which can serve as indicators of change. First, intercohort comparisons indicate the extent to which the white-nonwhite occupational distributions have become more similar from one census year to the next, e.g., the first two figures in the upper left corner of Table 1 indicate that in 1950 26.1% of the 25-34 year old nonwhite labor force with 0-7 years of education would have had to change major occupational categories in order to place them in the same kind of jobs which their white age and educational counterparts held. By 1960 that proportion had been reduced to 25.1. Twenty such comparisons can be made for each decade (1950-60 and 1960-70). Twelve of the twenty (60%) 1950-1960 comparisons showed reductions in

occupational discrimination; nineteen of the twenty comparisons for the 1960-70 decade show changes in the direction of equal opportunity for nonwhites.

The rows and columns labelled "average change" are the average changes during the decade in question over the appropriate age or educational category. It is clear in all cases that the change from 1960 to 1970 was considerably greater than the corresponding change from 1950 to 1960.

In addition to the absolute magnitude of the changes for 1960 to 1970, there are some interesting differences between the two decades in the patterning of change. These patterns are clearest if we look not only at the simple average change for a particular age or occupational level, but also at the change index labelled "change difficulty." This index is the proportionate reduction of discrimination for the age or educational group in question. As the absolute values of the figures in the body of Table 1 become smaller, it is likely that changes in the remaining discrimination will be more difficult. At the extremes, of course, it is clear that while it may be easy to reduce the index of dissimilarity from 50.0 to 40.0 it would be impossible to produce a ten point drop if the index were only 6 or 7 to start with. In addition, it is likely that as major inroads are made against occupational discrimination the differences remaining between the white and

nonwhite occupational distributions may be due to factors which are not easily affected by government programs designed to combat discrimination, e.g., differences in white and nonwhite job preferences, hard core discrimination in industries where evidence of discrimination is hard to compile, etc. The index of change difficulty takes these factors into account by expressing change in terms of its relationship to the difference remaining between the index of dissimilarity at the beginning of the decade and perfect equality. For example, the .24 in the bottom left corner of the table indicates that the change of 6.72 from 1960 to 1970 among men aged 25-34 represented a 24% drop in discrimination from that encountered by men in that age group in 1960.

Looking at these two indices of change by educational level, two patterns emerge. First, in terms of simple average change, the largest changes from 1950 to 1960 were in the middle educational categories including men who had completed grammar school through high school. This trend is also reflected in the index of change difficulty, showing almost no change from 1950 to 1960 at the upper educational levels. The pattern in the average change index for 1960-1970 is strikingly different, with the largest changes occurring at the lowest and highest educational levels. For the most recent decade, the index of change difficulty is roughly the same across the three middle educational levels,

but strikingly higher for men who had not completed grammar school and for men who had completed college. It is possible that this new pattern of change is related to the nature of the jobs for which moderately educated men qualify, an interpretation suggested by Siegel in his earlier paper.

Siegel noted that in 1950 and 1960 the index of dissimilarity was generally highest for men who had completed some college and dropped fairly dramatically for those who finished college. This pattern is still clearly present for the 1970 data. This pattern, (in connection with the evidence that change efforts were being more successful for men who finished college with an index of change difficulty equal to .25 as opposed to .08 for men with some college), led us to look in more detail at the sources of discrimination and change at the various educational levels. Siegel had speculated that the large index of dissimilarity for men with some college was a result of white reluctance to place nonwhites in positions of authority over whites and that nonwhite men with some college education who qualified for just those sorts of managerial positions did not get them, while their white counterparts did. Nonwhites who complete college, on the other hand, are able to move into professional positions where their clientele is more likely to be nonwhite and where they can to a greater extent control the nature of their own employment.

It was clearly the case in 1960 (Table 2) that the white-nonwhite difference in participation in the managerial

---

Table 2 About Here

---

occupations accounted for a good deal of the discrimination at the level of both 1-3 years of college and 4 or more years of college. For all age categories in both educational groups, the largest difference between white and nonwhite proportions in a major occupational category was for the managerial occupations with the difference averaging 17.7% for men with 1-3 years of college and 12.4% for men with 4 or more years of college. The next question, then, is where are the nonwhites who do not get managerial jobs. For those with 1-3 years of college the answer is clear: service.[1] For all age categories the occupations in which nonwhites were most overrepresented were the service occupations with the average white-nonwhite difference being -13.3% (this tendency is most pronounced for older men). For men who completed college the answer seems to depend even more upon age. Young (25-34 year old) college educated nonwhites are most overrepresented in the professional occupations (as hypothesized by Siegel) with the white-nonwhite difference equal to -8.4%. For older men the nonwhite over-representation seems to be spread fairly evenly among the

professional, clerical, sales, and service occupations.

For 1970 (Table 3) the pattern is similar with average underrepresentation of nonwhites in managerial positions

---

Table 3 About Here

---

equal to 14.6% for men with 1-3 years of college and 7.7% for men who completed college. Once again this is the category in which nonwhites are most underrepresented for all age groups. In 1970 the nonwhites with 1-3 years of college are primarily overrepresented among operatives, with a shift toward service occupations for older men. In 1970 nonwhite men who finished college were again overrepresented in the professions, but only to a trivial extent (average difference equal to -1.2%). There is no clearly overrepresented job category for nonwhites at this educational level.

Siegel's interpretation of patterns at the upper end of the educational scale fits the data relatively well. The relative lack of discrimination at the highest educational level is probably due to the ability of men who have finished college to control the nature of their own employment. The 1970 data, however, present us with a new phenomenon: fairly dramatic decreases in occupational discrimination at the very lowest educational level and only moderate to small changes among men who completed grammar school. Clearly the problem here cannot be related to

differences between employment processes for managers and professionals. The data for the two lowest educational levels (Tables 2 and 3) suggest the possibility that differences in reduction of discrimination at this educational level may be related to union control of the crafts and kindred occupations. At both educational levels the major source of discrimination against nonwhites is in the crafts, and reduction in differential representation in those occupations from 1960 to 1970 was minimal. The fairly large change from 1960 to 1970 among men who did not finish grammar school is primarily due to a reduction in discrimination in operative positions. Since at the next educational level (8-11 years) discrimination among operatives was relatively small in 1960, this source of change was not available. It would appear, then, that the successful reduction of occupational discrimination among men who do not attend college will depend primarily upon the success of efforts directed at the craft occupations, while change efforts at the upper educational levels must be aimed at managerial positions.

The pattern of change by age is as one might have expected. From 1960 to 1970 the major changes at all educational levels are among the younger groups of men (Table 1), particularly those aged 25-34. This was not the case for the 1950-60 decade and would seem to indicate that anti-discrimination programs are having their major impact on

young men who are just entering the labor force. Although there is evidence (Hauser and Featherman, 1974) that differences in white-nonwhite mobility patterns account for much of the difference between white and nonwhite occupational distributions, the better social position of young nonwhite workers should carry with them as they age (See intracohort comparisons below). Our emphasis upon the changes among young men should not minimize the fact that change in the older age cohorts for the 1960-70 decade was considerably greater than the change for the previous decade, and the difference between the two decades for men aged 55-64 was particularly dramatic.

Intracohort Comparisons. A second major type of comparison which can be made in Table 1 is comparison of occupational differences among the same group of men in each census year. Thus, in 1960 25.1% of the group of men with 0-7 years of education, aged 25-34 would have had to change their occupational categories to equalize the white- and nonwhite distributions. Among that same group of men in 1970, now aged 35-44 the index of dissimilarity is only 18.4. There are fifteen such comparisons in the table for each decade. Nine of the fifteen (60%) showed improvement for the 1950-60 decade, while all fifteen showed improvement for the more recent time period.

Income Inequality

The second major section of Siegel's article dealt with income inequality within major occupational categories, educational levels and regions of the country. Table 4 presents comparable data for 1970. The data are almost as

---

Table 4 About Here

---

remarkably consistent in 1970 as they were in 1960. Of the 116 comparisons of white and nonwhite income possible in Table 4, only 6 indicate nonwhite income equal to or greater than white income. All six of the deviant cases are in the North and they include farmers with four years of high school or some college, farm laborers with some college, and household service workers who have not completed grammar school, had four years of high school or some college.

Differences between the North and the South are similar to the patterns Siegel observed in 1960. Although in 228 of 232 comparisons incomes in the South are lower than those in the North, 113 of 116 comparisons of the gap between whites and nonwhites indicate larger differences between the two groups in the South.

Again as in 1960 it is clear that in general income increases with education (86 of 92 comparisons) and that education pays off more for men who get into occupations

which make use of their added training, particularly the professions, managerial positions and sales. It also still appears to be generally true that education pays off more for white men in the labor force than it does for nonwhites. There are 92 possible comparisons of white and nonwhite income increments from one educational level to another. Only 23 of those comparisons (25%) indicate a nonwhite increment equal to or greater than the corresponding increment for whites.[2] A crude measure of the extent of the differences is a comparison of the average increment between the educational categories within occupational categories (excluding household service): $1036 for whites, $587 for nonwhites.[3]

One consequence which follows from the differential payoff for education among whites and nonwhites is the increased gap between white and nonwhite income with increased education. As Siegel pointed out in 1965, the major push for equality of educational opportunity for nonwhites may move nonwhites into positions in the labor market where the gap between them and comparably educated whites is greatest. The second column of Table 5 indicates that this trend is still evident in 1970. In spite of the fact that

---

Table 5 About Here

---

nonwhite income at higher educational levels is a larger

proportion of white income, the absolute difference between white and nonwhite income steadily increases with education. It is unlikely that the average American worker computes a proportion when assessing his economic well-being relative to his coworkers. The typical nonwhite worker who strives to complete his education against the barriers of prejudice and discrimination which still exist, finds that the income gap between him and whites of comparable education is greater than it would have been had he saved his strength. Surely, his income is higher than it would have been had he dropped out, but his relative deprivation may be greater.

One of the more interesting techniques utilized by Siegel was the decomposition of white-nonwhite income differences into two components: first, the portion due to the differential social position of whites and nonwhites in terms of occupation, education, and region of country; and second, the portion due to white-nonwhite income differences within major occupational categories, educational levels, and regions of the country. Table 5 duplicates this analysis for 1970, allowing us to look at changes in income discrimination and its sources during the 1960-70 decade.

Looking first at changes within educational categories, it is encouraging (and not surprising, given our previous observations concerning occupational discrimination) to find that (1) at all educational levels there has been a decrease in that portion of the white-nonwhite income differential

which is due to differences in position in the occupational and regional structure of the nation, and (2) there has been a decrease in income differences within occupational and regional categories for men who have at least finished high school. Although it is somewhat discouraging to note the increased net discrimination at the lower educational levels, the percentage of the labor force who did not complete high school decreased for both whites and nonwhites during the 1960-70 decade, from 53% to 39% for whites and 77% to 63% for nonwhites (See Table 6).

Table 6 About Here

This shift upward in educational level for both whites and nonwhites is responsible for a phenomenon which Siegel predicted on the basis of his previous analysis. In spite of a general reduction in white-nonwhite income differences within educational levels, the overall gap between white and nonwhite income has increased during the 1960-70 decade. Although nonwhite income expressed as a proportion of white income has increased, indicating improvement in the situation in one sense, the decomposition in the last row of Table 5 indicates that while the differences due to white-nonwhite social position in terms of education, occupation and region of the country have decreased, the labor force has shifted upward to an educational level at which the gap

between whites and nonwhites within educational levels, occupational categories, and regions of the country is large. The increase during the decade in the total difference between white and nonwhite income is due to the rather dramatic increase in what Siegel characterized as "the cost of being Negro." In terms of 1969 dollars, the fee for being black was $1380 in 1960, and $1674 in 1970. In a sense, the indirect (or if you prefer, subtle) forms of income discrimination through educational and occupational differentiation have decreased and the blatant racism of differential income within occupational, educational, and regional categories has become more evident.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Since our major concern in this paper was with comparison of Siegel's data from the 1950 and 1960 censuses and data for 1970, and since the available 1970 data were not always identical to those available in previous years, we had to make a number of decisions concerning alternative approaches to compatibility.

Tables 1 and 3, innocent as they look, are the product of a series of agonizing decisions. There were enough changes in the presentation of data from 1960 to 1970 to force us to weigh alternative forms of deviation from strict comparability with Siegel's data. The 1970 Earnings by Occupation and Education volume did include a breakdown of

total and white males in the experienced civilian labor force by major occupational category and age, but the age breakdown included only three categories: 25-34, 35-54, and 55-64. We wanted to duplicate Siegel's full age cohort analysis. Unfortunately the Educational Attainment volume (Siegel's source in 1960) presented the breakdown we needed, but only for employed males, not for the experienced civilian labor force. That left us with the Occupational Characteristics volume's breakdown of the male experienced civilian labor force into total and black. We decided to use these data and to present for 1970 indices of occupational dissimilarity between blacks and nonblacks. Since 90% of the nonwhite male experienced civilian labor force over the age of 16 is black (Occupational Characteristics, Table 2), it was hoped that distortion resulting from the use of a black-nonblack breakdown in 1970 rather than white-nonwhite would be minimal. However, it is likely that, in general, indices of dissimilarity for a black-nonblack breakdown will probably be higher than those for a similar white-nonwhite breakdown and our analysis will underestimate change during the 1960-70 decade. We were able to check on the extent of this effect for the selected age and educational categories for which comparable black-nonblack and white-nonwhite breakdowns were available. Table 7 presents these comparisons.

Table 7 About Here

Tables 4 and 5 presented a different problem. The earnings data were not presented for nonwhites, but only for total and white males. The nonwhite income figures are therefore approximations computed by means of the formula: $I_{nw} = I_t - P_w(I_w)/P_{nw}$, where I_{nw} was the derived nonwhite income, I_t was the mean income for the total male civilian labor force, P_w was the proportion white in that particular educational, regional, and occupational category, I_w was the reported mean income for whites, and P_{nw} was the proportion nonwhite in that particular educational, regional, and occupational category. This computational technique is relatively subject to rounding error when the proportion nonwhite is particularly small. The 1960 figures were recomputed to combine the two lower educational levels and were then multiplied by 1.25733 to express the differences in terms of 1969 dollars. The 1970 decomposition is based upon all 12 occupational categories, rather than the ten which were available in 1960.

The data in Table 6 on educational attainment were taken from the Earnings by Occupation and Education volume, since we were interested in the effects of educational shifts on income differences within the male civilian labor force aged 25-64.

Although all income data presented in the body of this paper refer to white-nonwhite differences in order to maintain comparability with the 1960 data, the 1970 census allowed a similar analysis for black-white differences, and we feel that it might be useful to present these data here (See Table 8).

Table 8 About Here

Table 1

Indices of Dissimilarity Between White and Nonwhite Occupational Distributions for Males Aged 25-64 in the United States, 1950, 1960, 1970 By Age and Education*

Education	Age 25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Avg. Change	Change Difficulty
0-7 Years						
1950	26.1	28.3	28.4	30.4		
1960	25.1	25.9	28.8	30.4	.75	.03
1970	17.7	18.4	21.9	25.7	6.62	.24
8-11 Years						
1950	29.0	34.2	36.2	33.3		
1960	27.4	29.8	32.0	35.1	2.10	.06
1970	21.7	26.4	28.8	31.7	3.92	.13
H.S. 4 Yrs.						
1950	33.8	39.1	40.5	36.9		
1960	33.4	34.1	35.8	38.7	2.08	.06
1970	28.4	31.8	33.8	35.6	3.10	.09
College 1-3						
1950	38.8	39.5	39.3	29.2		
1960	34.4	38.2	37.6	34.8	0.45	.01
1970	27.6	32.7	37.0	36.5	2.80	.08
College > 4						
1950	17.8	17.8	21.6	17.2		
1960	18.6	19.1	18.7	19.0	-0.25	--
1970	9.9	15.8	15.9	15.0	4.70	.25
Avg. Change						
1950-60	1.38	2.36	2.62	-2.20		
1960-70	6.72	4.40	3.10	2.70		
Change Difficulty						
1950-60	.05	.07	.08	--		
1960-70	.24	.15	.10	.09		

*Figures from 1950 are for employed males, 1960 and 1970 for experienced labor force. 1950 and 1960 figures are white-nonwhite comparisons, 1970 is black-nonblack. See methodological note (p.)

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1950, 4 Special Report, Part 5, Chapter B, Education Table 11; and U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Educational Attainment, Table 8; and U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Occupational Characteristics, Tables 8 and 9.

Table 2

White Percent Minus Nonwhite Percent in Major Occupational Category by Age and Education: 1960

Education	Age	Prof.	Man.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Labor	Farm	F. Lab.	Service
0-7	25-34	00.3*	01.9	01.3	00.9	11.5	09.0	-15.7	-00.7	-03.8	-04.7
	35-44	00.5	03.2	01.6	00.7	14.6	05.1	-16.7	00.3	-04.0	-05.1
	45-54	00.4	03.8	01.9	01.0	15.0	05.0	-16.1	01.8	-05.0	-07.2
	55-64	00.4	04.8	02.6	01.8	15.5	03.9	-15.9	01.3	-06.7	-07.9
8-11	25-34	01.4	04.3	03.0	00.1	15.5	00.7	-15.4	02.5	-01.6	-10.4
	35-44	01.2	05.9	03.4	-00.4	15.3	-03.5	-14.8	04.0	-01.1	-10.0
	45-54	01.0	08.1	03.8	00.6	13.8	-03.0	-13.5	04.7	-01.4	-14.2
	55-64	00.8	08.5	05.1	01.9	13.4	-04.3	-12.3	05.3	-02.1	-16.5
4 H.S.	25-34	04.0	08.9	05.7	-02.9	12.5	-09.5	-11.0	03.9	-00.8	-10.9
	35-44	03.7	11.1	06.2	-03.7	10.2	-09.0	-10.0	03.0	-00.7	-10.8
	45-54	02.6	14.8	06.8	-02.1	08.0	-08.2	-09.1	03.6	-01.2	-15.2
	55-64	03.6	16.1	08.4	-00.2	06.9	-07.7	-08.5	03.6	-01.0	-21.3
1-3 College	25-34	08.2	12.1	09.9	-08.2	02.9	-09.7	-06.4	01.3	-00.3	-09.9
	35-44	07.2	18.1	10.6	-08.6	00.7	-10.7	-06.8	01.6	-00.6	-11.7
	45-54	06.3	19.7	09.9	-08.3	00.1	-08.2	-04.8	01.6	-00.1	-16.4
	55-64	04.8	21.1	07.5	-04.5	-01.0	-06.6	-06.8	01.5	-01.0	-15.1
4 College	25-34	-08.4	09.2	07.7	-03.9	01.0	-02.0	-01.1	00.6	-00.2	-03.0
	35-44	-04.5	12.4	06.0	-06.0	00.3	-02.8	-01.7	00.4	-00.3	-04.0
	45-54	-04.2	13.5	04.7	-05.2	-00.7	-02.3	-02.2	00.5	-00.1	-04.1
	55-64	-03.4	14.4	04.3	-03.7	00.4	-02.7	-02.6	00.0	-00.1	-06.6

*For example, 00.7% of 25-34 year old whites with 0-7 years of education were in professional occupations as compared with 00.4% of 25-34 year old nonwhites with 0-7 years of education. Difference = 00.3.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Educational Attainment, Table 8.

Table 3

Nonblack Percent Minus Black Percent in Major Occupational Categories by Age and Education: 1970

Education	Age	Prof.	Man.	Sales	Cler.	Crafts	Oper.	Labor	Farm	F. Lab.	Service
0-7	25-34	00.6	02.0	01.1	00.0	10.6	03.2	-10.8	00.2	-04.1	-02.8
	35-44	00.6	02.9	01.4	00.4	11.7	00.5	-11.6	01.0	-02.7	-04.1
	45-54	00.7	03.4	01.5	00.4	11.8	02.0	-13.1	02.1	-03.1	-05.7
	55-64	00.6	03.9	02.2	01.0	13.2	01.5	-14.4	03.3	-03.4	-07.9
8-11	25-34	00.9	03.7	02.1	-01.3	13.7	-04.1	-08.6	01.3	-01.2	-06.4
	35-44	01.3	05.8	02.7	-00.8	13.9	-07.9	-08.8	02.7	-00.7	-08.2
	45-54	01.1	06.5	03.3	-00.6	13.7	-06.6	-10.4	04.1	-00.7	-10.5
	55-64	01.2	07.0	04.3	00.0	13.7	-05.7	-10.5	05.5	-00.7	-14.8
4 H.S.	25-34	04.1	06.2	03.9	-03.3	12.0	-13.3	-05.7	02.1	00.1	-06.0
	35-44	03.5	10.2	04.8	-03.2	09.9	-13.4	-06.8	03.5	-00.1	-08.3
	45-54	03.9	11.3	06.6	-04.2	08.7	-11.4	-07.4	03.3	00.0	-10.8
	55-64	03.4	12.9	07.9	-00.6	07.3	-09.7	-08.0	04.1	-00.3	-16.9
1-3 College	25-34	07.1	09.3	06.8	-07.8	02.8	-11.9	-03.3	01.2	00.3	-04.7
	35-44	06.8	14.9	08.9	-09.7	00.7	-11.0	-04.0	01.4	-00.1	-07.9
	45-54	08.2	16.7	10.2	-08.5	-01.8	-11.0	-04.1	01.9	-00.3	-11.3
	55-64	07.0	17.6	09.8	-06.5	-02.2	-07.8	-05.1	01.9	-00.7	-14.4
> 4 College	25-34	-01.8	04.7	04.6	-01.7	-01.2	-02.7	-00.8	00.6	00.1	-01.6
	35-44	-03.6	09.2	06.3	-03.6	-02.2	-02.2	-01.1	00.3	00.0	-03.0
	45-54	00.3	09.4	05.6	-05.0	-02.0	-03.2	-01.3	00.6	00.0	-04.4
	55-64	00.5	07.7	05.6	-03.7	-02.1	-02.8	-02.3	01.2	-00.4	-03.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Occupational Characteristics, Tables 8 and 9

Table 4

White and Nonwhite Earnings by Education, Major Occupational Category and Region: 1970

		NORTH					SOUTH					
		0-8	1-3 HS	4 HS	1-3 C.	>4 C.	0-8	1-3 HS	4 HS	1-3 C.	>4 C.	Avg. Incr.
Professional	Whi.	9764	10719	11092	11489	15150	8169	9590	10292	10915	14664	1485
	N.W.	7711	7629	8728	9097	12377	5131	6137	7506	7666	9664	1150
Managerial	Whi.	10707	11861	12630	14428	18617	8948	10336	11342	13035	16744	1963
	N.W.	7938	8273	9630	10280	13034	5751	6704	7050	7910	10801	1268
Sales	Whi.	8929	10009	10804	12391	15455	7165	8682	9687	10989	15942	1913
	N.W.	6096	7137	7952	8276	10778	4086	5376	5645	6878	8380	1122
Clerical	Whi.	7522	8172	8667	9082	11056	6537	7609	8009	8550	10682	960
	N.W.	6550	6706	7243	7511	8353	5225	5967	6371	6895	7656	529
Craft	Whi.	8309	9136	9731	10131	12161	6629	7777	8449	9000	11461	1086
	N.W.	6999	7366	8122	8331	9101	4684	5375	5956	6309	6721	517
Oper. Exc. Transport	Whi.	7226	7950	8358	8481	9486	5813	6830	7474	7921	9165	702
	N.W.	6467	6688	7160	7559	7564	4446	4901	5511	5903	6720	434
Transport Operatives	Whi.	7734	8460	8713	8511	8419	6011	7083	7519	7439	7574	281
	N.W.	6716	6924	7455	9608	7995	4440	5106	5600	5575	5374	277
Labor	Whi.	6332	7065	7501	7384	7954	4543	5674	6383	6793	6683	368
	N.W.	5829	6156	6647	6953	6893	3784	4376	4859	5184	4207	186
Farmers	Whi.	6291	7197	7900	8570	9308	4384	5924	6708	8646	9681	1039
	N.W.	4591	6582	9200	9170	7725	2184	3004	3988	4146	2622	446
Farm Labor	Whi.	4011	4943	5683	6068	8132	3017	4475	5916	6731	8611	1214
	N.W.	3609	3339	4914	6439	4201	2150	2631	3189	3004	5361	475
Service Exc. Household	Whi.	5937	6915	8014	8485	9204	4864	6119	6954	7396	9868	1034
	N.W.	5260	5673	6401	7200	7028	3927	4381	4919	5172	5728	446
Household Service	Whi.	3862	3621	4573	4838	--	2309	2902	--	--	--	
	N.W.	4487	3160	5028	5103	--	1955	2100	--	--	--	

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Earnings by Occupation and Education, Tables 3 and 4.

Table 5

Decomposition of White-Nonwhite Mean Income Differences

Education		NW/W	Total Difference	Composition*	Net
0-8	1960	.62	2137	1059	1078
	1970	.70	2102	979	1123
1-3 H.S.	1960	.63	2557	952	1605
	1970	.70	2612	906	1706
4 H.S.	1960	.64	2803	1035	1768
	1970	.72	2618	880	1738
1-3 College	1960	.58	4023	1812	2211
	1970	.69	3357	1233	2124
>4 College	1960	.55	5744	965	4779
	1970	.71	4459	761	3698
All ed. levels	1960	.53	3587	2207	1380
	1970	.63	3708	2034	1674

*Within educational levels composition is the part of the difference due to differential representation in major occupational categories and regions of the country. Composition for "all educational levels" also removes the portion of the difference due to differential access to education.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Occupation by Earnings and Education, Tables 2 and 3; and U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Earnings by Occupation and Education, Tables 3 and 4.

Table 6

Educational Attainment of White and Nonwhite Males in the Experienced Civilian Labor Force: 1960 and 1970

		0-8	1-3 HS	4 HS	1-3 C	>4C	D*
1960	White	.32	.21	.25	.10	.12	26.0
	Nonwhite	.58	.19	.14	.05	.04	
1970	White	.20	.19	.32	.12	.17	22.5
	Nonwhite	.37	.25	.24	.08	.07	

*Duncan's index of dissimilarity.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Reports, Occupations by Earnings and Education, Table 1; and U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Earnings by Occupation and Education, Table 1.

Table 7

Comparison of Black-Nonblack Occupational Differentials with White-Nonwhite Occupational Differentials: 1970

		Prof.	Man	Sales	Cler.	Craft	Oper.	Labor	Farm	F. Lab	Service	D
4HS 25-34	W-NW	03.6	06.0	04.0	-03.1	10.9	-11.8	-05.6	02.1	-00.2	-06.2	26.8
	B-NB	04.1	06.2	03.9	-03.3	12.0	-13.3	-05.7	02.1	00.1	-06.0	28.4
4HS 55-64	W-NW	03.0	11.3	07.2	-00.3	06.3	-07.1	-07.8	03.7	-00.8	-15.5	31.5
	B-NB	03.4	12.9	07.9	-00.6	07.3	-09.7	-08.0	04.1	-00.3	-16.9	35.6
1-3C 25-34	W-NW	05.0	08.7	06.9	-07.1	02.4	-10.0	-03.1	01.2	00.2	-04.4	24.5
	B-NB	07.1	09.3	06.8	-07.8	02.8	-11.9	-03.3	01.2	00.3	-04.7	27.6
1-3C 55-64	W-NW	05.1	17.0	10.1	-06.3	-01.4	-06.3	-04.5	01.9	-01.2	-14.2	34.0
	B-NB	07.0	17.6	09.8	-06.5	-02.2	-07.8	-05.1	01.9	-00.7	-14.4	36.5
>4 Col 25-34	W-NW	-05.5	05.9	05.0	-01.4	-00.5	-02.0	-00.5	00.6	00.0	-01.5	11.5
	B-NB	-01.8	04.7	04.6	-01.7	-01.2	-02.7	-00.8	00.6	00.1	-01.6	9.9
>4 C 55-64	W-NW	00.0	06.6	05.3	-03.3	-01.6	-02.4	-01.8	01.0	-00.5	-03.2	12.9
	B-NB	00.5	07.7	05.6	-03.7	-02.1	-02.8	-02.3	01.2	-00.4	-03.8	15.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Occupational Characteristics, Tables 8 and 9; and U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Earnings by Occupation and Education, Table 1.

Table 8

Decomposition of Black-White Mean Income Differences: 1970

Education

	Total	Composition*	Net
0-8	2162	1030	1132
1-3 H.S.	2724	1045	1679
4 H.S.	2838	968	1870
1-3 College	3655	1412	2243
4 College	5614	1532	4082
>5 College	4397	496	3901

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Reports, Earnings by Occupation and Education.

*See footnote to Table 5.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Of course, it does not follow in any strict sense from such an aggregate analysis that the men who did not get managerial positions moved into the professions. The data are merely suggestive of such an interpretation.

[2]It is curious that 14 of those 23 reversals involve the step from some high school to completion of high school. It would appear that while, in general, education does not pay off as well for nonwhites as for whites, the completion of high school is a fairly general exception, particularly in the North. For 11 of 12 occupational categories in the North, the income increment for nonwhite resulting from the completion of high school is greater than that for whites.

[3]It should be noted that these crude averages will underestimate the difference between payoffs for education for whites and nonwhites, since occupational discrimination generally forces nonwhites into just those occupations where education pays off least, e.g., operatives, labor, and service.

REFERENCES

Duncan, O. D. and B. Duncan. 1955. "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indices." American Sociological Review 20 (April):210-217

Farley, R. and A. Hermalin. 1972. "The 1960's: A Decade of Progress for Blacks?" Demography 9 (August):353-370

Fox, W. S. and J. R. Faine. 1973. "Trends in White-nonwhite Income Equality." Sociology and Social Research 57 (April):288-299

Hauser, R. M. and D. L. Featherman. 1974. "White-nonwhite Differentials in Occupational Mobility Among Men in the United States, 1962-1972." Demography 11 (May): 247-265

Johnson, M. P. and R. R. Sell. 1974. "The Cost of Being a Woman: 1970." Unpublished Manuscript

Siegel, P. M. 1965. "On the Cost of Being a Negro." Sociological Inquiry 35 (Winter):41-57

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1953. U. S. Census of Population: 1950, Special Report 5B, Education. Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing Office

_____. 1963. U. S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Report PC(2)-5B, Educational Attainment. Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing Office

_____. 1963. U. S. Census of Population: 1960, Subject Report PC(2)-7B, Occupation by Earnings and Education. Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing Office

_____. 1973. U. S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Report PC(2)-7A, Occupational Characteristics. Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing Office

_____. 1973. U. S. Census of Population: 1970, Subject Report PC(2)-8B, Earnings by Occupation and Education. Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing Office